



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

There must be a new social conscience to right social wrongs, and there must be a new international conscience to right international wrongs. A writer in the *Forum* a few years ago said: "An employer is under no more financial obligation to his workmen after he has paid their current wages than they are to him or to a passer-by on the street whom they never saw." Another man of much the same school writes: "Every man and woman in society has one big duty: that is, to take care of his or her own self." He tries to relieve this teaching of something of its crassness by adding: "This is a social duty, . . . and the latter [social duty] is accomplished when the former is done." It is plain to all but the dullest and blindest today that such an attitude as these two men represent is the greatest enemy of industrial peace. Such an attitude has to go before we have any permanent guarantee of peace in the social order. These men are industrial pirates.

We are rapidly rising above such a creed in social ethics. But in national ethics we are slower in rising. Prevailing patriotism does not rise much above the idea that "every [nation] has one big duty to take care of her own self." This conception of our big duty to look out for No. 1—to be "for America, right or wrong," to have regard only for America's selfish interests—is a constant menace to peace. It is the creed of a national pirate. It is the kind of creed that tears up treaties into scraps and steps on the neck of the weak in the name of "Unser Gott." Such an idea of patriotism breeds distrust and suspicion. It is always arming for "defense." It is hypersensitive in the matter of "national honor." It lists at length the things in which "America could never submit to arbitration." There is no safety for any nation so long as it clings to this out-

law idea of patriotism. If this war teaches us anything, it should teach us that the fortunes of the nations are inseparably intertwined, and that no nation looks out for its own welfare who looks out only for its own welfare. Good will distributes our interests and guarantees peace.

There are loud and raucous voices saying that this philosophy won't work. It is all right to sing about "good will" at Christmas time, but it is too refined a sentiment for use in practical affairs. People who advocate it are "impractical," "dreamers," "silly," "spineless pacifists," and a "peril to the nation. It is easy to call names. It always has been. Hard-headed "practical" people of affairs called the Prince of Peace "crazy," a "blasphemer," and a peril to the throne of Cæsar. No one should be intimidated by a name. This brutal and lustful war, which has sickened the earth with smell and taste of blood, has struck faith and reason a blow which has made them blink. In the face of this orgy of hate it sometimes has seemed futile to preach the power of love and good will. But this shameful conflict will end some day soon. The bloody God of War will shut his dripping jaws, his disgusting maw distended with the bodies of too many men, because the chords in the hearts of the nations will be touched by the "angel of [their] better natures," and they will see that they ought to live together as comrades, not as foes.

We advocate the gospel of good will, not because it is a pretty sentiment, but because it is the only adequate gospel. Good will is the only "insurance" that nations can rely upon. No other foundation can be laid for peace than that which was laid over nineteen centuries ago. Christmas logic is the only logic for the situation.

THE DANGER OF MILITARISM IN CHINA

By A. Warburton Davidson, Chungking (West China).

A RECENT issue of *The National Review* (China) contained a long article by "A Chinese Student" on "The History of China's Army," which shows clearly that Young China's hope for the future is in militarism, and that the recent Chino-Japanese crisis has given a great impetus to the military spirit all over China.

At the outset the writer refers to the anxiety which exists "as to what part my people are to play in the world's history." This is seen in the high respect and enthusiasm displayed by the people at large in the new development in military affairs and in the recent revival of the President's interest, as evidenced by his decision to form a nucleus "model army." These new developments are of great significance, for they indicate that "our martial spirit is not quite dead, but only needs awakening."

It is often said that China is not a military race—and perhaps now she is not—but "A Chinese Student" points out that this has not always been so, and he gives several illustrations from history to prove his point. "In the time of feudalism" (770-221 B. C.), he says, "every man had, during some part of the year, to practice the art of fighting, and a long sword was the distinction of a gen-

tleman. Confucius himself wore that weapon all the way in his travels, although it is doubtful whether he ever made use of it." "After the year 221 B. C. feudalism was abolished, and the Emperor sent his general (Men Tien) to the northern frontier with an army of 300,000. This is perhaps the first time China had a standing army." He then refers to two glorious periods in the history of his country

"which a Chinese can never forget." "The great Emperor Wu-Ti, of the House of Han (206 B. C., 220 A. D.), began his military career 128 B. C., and before that he had already gained a decisive victory over the Huiangnu (probably the Turks of later date). With a view to turn their flank, he conquered the northern part of Korea, and formed alliances with those races who lived in what is now known as Ili, and the new territory. It was this same Emperor who conquered the whole of the Chinese Empire which lies south of the Yangtze.

The policy of the T'ang Dynasty (A. D. 618-922) was much less warlike than that of Han, but under that dynasty China conquered Korea, and drove out the Tartars in the north, and united under the direct rule of central government the States which then existed in the south. Our influence was recognized by Persia, India, Indo-China, and Japan, especially by Persia. Romance and bravery are not wanting in our history. But alas! good fortune deserted us after

A. D. 922. Civil war and foreign invasion followed each other, and famine, sword, and fire brought insufferable miseries upon us, until we came to hate war, to love peace, and to despise a soldier. . . . By the end of the first half of the 19th century there was not one gentleman (or educated man, which in my country means the same thing) in our army. A soldier in the eyes of the Chinese citizen soon became no better than a dog that is employed to watch a house. 'No good man would be a soldier, no good iron would be a nail,' is the popular proverb."

The causes which brought about this change are significant. The writer points out that the change was due, in the first instance, to Confucianism. "Confucius, who saw the horrors of war as waged in his time by the ruling princes against each other, preached again and again that 'a wise king should always win his enemy over by goodness and not by force.'" Ever since the ascendancy of Confucianism the national sentiment of anti-militarism advanced, and military glory disappeared altogether from the history of China.

"Another powerful endorsement of anti-militarism was Buddhism, which spread over the country from the eighth century." It was a more powerful anti-military force even than Confucius, for it did not confine itself to the upper class. It won over the entire female population, and through them exercised a powerful influence against militarism. Many writers in the twelfth century who were the sternest Confucianists had unconsciously inherited Buddhism from their mothers, although they denounced it as false and heretic.

The writer concludes by urging his readers "to arouse the latent military spirit of our people and prepare, not

merely to meet the enemy in the gate, but to rally forth and disperse him on the open field. We are not in a position to subscribe to the vulgar distich, 'We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do, we've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the money, too,' but we can certainly subscribe whole-heartedly to the first sentence of it. The question is, Are we to prepare ourselves, to put ourselves into a position to be able sincerely and without boasting to subscribe to the whole couplet? The answer depends very largely on the conduct of our neighbors toward us."

From the foregoing it will be noticed that hitherto the powerful forces in China working against militarism have been Confucianism and Buddhism, but we are now face to face with the fact that both of these are fast losing their hold upon New China, and that materialism is making more headway than Christianity. Confucianism and Buddhism are believed, by an ever-growing number, to have developed the anti-militarism of China. The trend of events in China at the present time is fraught with much danger for the future. The army is already as large as is the Japanese; conscription is being pressed for by men in high position. The soldier is becoming popular, and military schools and arsenals are being established all over the land. The student class which are the hope of China, believe that there is no salvation for their country except by following the example of Europe and arming themselves to the teeth.

This condition should constitute a strong call to friends of peace everywhere to make haste to save China from what is ruining Europe today!

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

A LETTER FROM GUSTAV SPILLER

GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ETHICAL SOCIETIES, LONDON

SIR: THE ABOVE is the thought-provoking title of a new and influential organization formed in the United States, whose intention, to judge solely by this superscription, is to force the gates of the Kingdom of Peace. We are at once enticed to imagine sundry large and small powers issuing a proclamation to the effect that he who shall dare to break the world's peace shall himself be remorselessly broken. Involuntarily we begin to ask ourselves who these altruistic modern knight-errants are likely to be and what are the prospects of their cowering or felling the enemies of mankind.

On examining the "platform" of this league, our enthusiasm is changed to keen disappointment, for, as so often happens with titles, they suggest visions and cloak feeble compromises. The league's object, in plain language, is not at all to enforce peace. Nations need not identify themselves with the league, in which case it will be unconcerned whether they war or not, nor does the league place any obstacles in the way of its members feloniously falling on non-signatory powers. The nations which do join the league are expected to retain their armies and navies, and may unrebuked plunge into war with signatory powers, provided they first burn a few grains of incense by satisfying certain formalities. In other words, when a difference between members of the league cannot be disposed of by negotiation, they must

give a few months' notice before they sound the gong of war, unless, indeed, they circumvent the demands made on them.

The league is solely concerned with signatory powers. Should a dispute of a justiciable character arise between any of these, it must be "submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment;" but once the judgment is delivered, the parties to the dispute may apply cold steel to the solution.

In respect of non-justiciable questions, the arrangement proposed is that these should be "submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration, and recommendation." This recommendation the parties to the dispute are at liberty to ignore, and a declaration of war may ensue promptly without the league having a right to intervene, or even protest.

Should, however, any of the signatory powers attack any of their fellow signatory powers without submitting their dispute to the competent authorities or waiting for the decision or recommendation, then "the signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces" against the offending party or parties.

Lastly, occasional conferences between the signatory powers are to be held for the purpose of formulating and codifying rules of international law.